



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/615,574	07/13/2000	Jeremy Wertheimer	09765-015001	4957
26161	7590	11/23/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/615,574

Applicant(s)

WERTHEIMER ET AL.

S

Examiner

Akiba K Robinson-Boyce

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Claims***

1. Due to communications filed 11/5/04, the following is a non-final office action. Claims 13, 21-23, and 25 have been amended. Claim 31 is cancelled. Claims 1-30 and 32 are currently pending in this application and have been examined on the merits. The previous office action has been withdrawn and the following reflects the claims as amended.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: Grammatical errors. In line 4 of claim 21, "produce an potential" should be replaced by "produce a potential". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "potential, actual availability response" in claim 21 is a relative terms that renders the claims indefinite. The term "potential, actual availability response" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining

the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Because the term "potential, actual availability response" is used, the entire claim and the scope of the invention unclear. The examiner is interpreting the response as an actual response.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walker et al (US 5,897,620).

As per claim 21, Walker et al discloses:

produce an potential, actual availability response for a flight, (Col. 5, lines 15-33, [monitoring the actual demand to reevaluate the inventory and transmitting the inventory information to the CRS, in this case, the determination of the inventory allocated to actual flights from the actual demand represents the actual availability response]);

predict seating availability on a competitor's flight that is a competitive flight to the flight, (Col. 8, lines 40-50, [seat allocation of competitive forces stored once calculated, where the RMS represents the availability predictor], (Col. 13, lines 31-48, [shows request for flight information for a specific itinerary, wherein the traveler is

notified of the potential availability]]).

compare the predicted answer and the potential, actual availability response to establish an actual seat availability answer, (col. 4, lines 37-44, [RMS system represents the computing system], w/ Col. 5, lines 18-25, [comparing actual demand to expected (forecasted) demand, where decision is determining whether or not to allocate additional inventory or reduce/eliminate inventory]).

As per claim 22, Walker et al discloses:

wherein the instructions to compare biases the potential actual availability response a- based upon a relative competitive position of the competitor according to the predicted answer, (col. 9, lines 14-21, [correct for competitive forces]).

As per claim 23, Walker et al discloses:

modify the potential, actual availability response in response to the predicted answer and the potential availability answer to produce the actual seat availability answer, (col. 9, lines 14-28, [where it is shown that the RMS executes a process to correct for competitive forces by deciding whether or not to increase inventory {availability of seats}]).

As per claim 25, Walker et al discloses:

wherein the predicted answer has a plurality of states, (Col. 5, lines 19-25, [where it is shown that the actual demand can be either greater than or less than the expected demand]).

As per claim 26, Walker et al discloses:

wherein the one of the states is a neutral state that does not tend to modify the

Art Unit: 3623

potential answer received from the availability system, (Col. 12, line 62-Col. 13, line 2, [remaining inventory = 0]).

As per claim 27, Walker et al discloses:

wherein the one of states biases the potential, actual availability response towards producing the actual answer that a seat is available, (Col. 5, lines 20-24, [allocate additional inventory {seats}]).

As per claim 28, Walker et al discloses:

wherein one of states biases the potential, actual availability response towards producing the actual answer that a seat is not available, (col. 5, lines 23-25, [reduce/eliminate inventory]).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 14-19, 21-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al (US 5,897,620), and further in view of Talluri (US 6,263,315).

As per claims 1, 17, Walker et al discloses:

An availability predictor that predicts seating availability on a competitive flight/receiving by the computer system a request for availability of seating on an airline flight and executing in the computer system...to predict the seating availability on a competitive flight, (Col. 8, lines 40-50, [seat allocation of competitive forces stored once calculated, where the RMS represents the availability predictor], (Col. 13, lines 31-48, [shows request for flight information for a specific itinerary, wherein the traveler is notified of the potential availability]]).

An availability system that produces an actual availability response for a flight/receiving by the computer system an actual availability response for a flight;(Col. 5, lines 15-33, [monitoring the actual demand to reevaluate the inventory and transmitting the inventory information to the CRS]);

A computing system...that compares the predicted answer from the availability predictor and the potential answer from the availability system to establish a decision with respect to actual availability system to establish a decision with respect to actual availability/comparing the predicted answer from the availability predictor and the potential answer from the availability system to establish a decision with respect to actual availability, (col. 4, lines 37-44, [RMS system represents the computing system], w/ Col. 5, lines 18-25, [comparing actual demand to expected (forecasted) demand, where decision is determining whether or not to allocate additional inventory or reduce/eliminate inventory]).

Walker et al fails to disclose decision logic or an algorithm, but does disclose that decisions are made according to inventory allocation in col. 5, lines 18-25.

Art Unit: 3623

However, Talluri discloses:

decision logic/an algorithm, (Abstract, lines 1-5, [using control logic to support decisions to accept or deny requests for resource capacity (seats)], and Col. 5, lines 4-5, [actually shows decision logic]/Col. 2, lines 30-35, [shows that in control logic schemes, algorithms are used to compute parameters])). Talluri discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that logic means (by way of algorithms) are used to decide whether or not a seat is available.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include decision logic/ an algorithm with the motivation of determining seat availability in accordance with rules of decision logic.

As per claims 2, 18, Walker et al discloses:

wherein the decision of the decision logic is a bias that determines whether the potential answer should be modified based upon the relative competitive position of the competitor represented by the availability predictor/wherein comparing produces a decision that is a bias that determined whether the potential answer should be modified based upon the relative competitive position of the competitor represented by the availability predictor, (col. 9, lines 14-21, [correct for competitive forces]).

As per claims 3, 19, Walker et al discloses:

Modify/modifying the actual availability answer in accordance with the bias from the decision logic to modify the actual availability answer in accordance with the bias, (col. 9, lines 14-28, [where it is shown that the RMS executes a process to correct for competitive forces by deciding whether or not to increase inventory {availability of



seats})).

Walker et al does not specifically disclose modifying logic that is responsive to the availability response from the availability system and from the bias from the decision logic, but does disclose that decisions are made according to inventory allocation in col. 5, lines 18-25.

However, Talluri discloses:

Modifying logic, (Col. 5, lines 4-9, [shown that decision logic has the additional flexibility to allow the threshold to adjust]). Talluri discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that logic means are used to adjust values

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include modifying logic with the motivation of adjusting data in accordance with logic rules.

As per claim 5, Walker et al discloses:

Wherein the decision as to an actual availability answer is based on the decision from the decision logic, (col. 5, lines 15-25, [where the decision for actual flights is represented by the reevaluation of inventory (seats) allocated]).

As per claim 6, Walker et al discloses:

Wherein the decision from the decision logic can have a plurality of states (Col. 5, lines 19-25, [where it is shown that the actual demand can be either greater than or less than the expected demand]).

As per claim 7, Walker et al discloses:

Wherein one of the states includes a neutral state that does not tend to modify

the potential answer received from the availability system (Col. 12, line 62-Col. 13, line 2, [remaining inventory = 0]).

As per claim 8, Walker et al discloses:

Wherein one of states biases a potential answer towards answering that seat is available (Col. 5, lines 20-24, [allocate additional inventory {seats}]).

As per claim 9, Walker et al discloses:

Wherein one of states biases a potential answer towards answering that seat is not available, (col. 5, lines 23-25, [reduce/eliminate inventory]).

As per claim 10, Walker et al discloses:

Wherein state depends upon the relative competitive position of the competitor represented by the availability predictor (Col. 9, lines 14-21, [increasing inventory based on competitor forces]).

As per claims 14, 15, Walker et al discloses:

wherein if the competitor's available booking codes are at a lower price than those being offered by the user of the system, the system returns a bias towards making the seat available/wherein if the competitor's available booking codes are at a lower price than those being offered by the user of the system, the system determines whether the query was for a high cost fare, and returns a bias towards making the seat available if for a high cost fare, (col. 9, lines 18-22, [correcting for competitor forces by increasing inventory {seats available}]).

As per claim 16, Walker et al discloses:

Wherein the messages that are returned change the availability message from

the availability system (Col. 5, lines 15-25, [reevaluating and allocating additional inventory]).

9. Claims 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Walker et al (US 5,897,620), in further view of Talluri (6,263,315), and in further view of Lynch et al (US Patent 6,018,715).

As per claim 4, neither Walker et al nor Talluri disclose wherein the decision logic determines whether the prediction from the availability predictor indicates that a competitor is in a more favorable or less favorable competitive position than the answer produced by the availability system. However, Walker et al and Talluri would have included the above limitation with the motivation of determining if the available seats on an airline are accommodating to customers.

However Lynch et al 715' discloses:

Wherein the decision logic determines whether the prediction from the availability predictor indicates that a competitor is in a more favorable or less favorable competitive position than the answer produced by the availability system (Col. 7, lines 17-40, where the decision logic is represented as fuzzy logic [representations] in Lynch et al and they determine that Delta Airlines, American Airlines and Continental Airlines [all competitors] have different logic values which are weighted according to preferred plan). Lynch '715 discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of determining if customers prefer the accommodation for the flight.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to determine whether the prediction from the availability predictor

indicates that a competitor is in a more favorable or less favorable competitive position with the motivation of determining the best travel arrangement according to the traveler's preferences and satisfying the traveler as a customer.

10. Claims 11-13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al (US 5,897,620), and further in view of Talluri (6,263,315), and further in view of Lynch et al (US 6,119,094).

As per claims 11, 20, neither Walker et al nor Talluri disclose wherein the decision logic determines whether the competitor's available booking codes are at a lower price than those which the availability system indicated the user of the system can offer/determining whether the competitor's available booking codes are at a lower price. However, Walker et al and Talluri would have included the above limitation with the motivation of determining if the available seats on an airline are accommodating to customers.

However, Lynch et al '094 discloses:

Wherein the decision logic determines whether the competitor's available booking codes are at a lower price than those which the availability system indicated the user of the system can offer/determining whether the competitor's available booking codes are at a lower price, (Col. 3, lines 59-63, [alternate, low-cost travel arrangements]). Lynch et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of accommodating the customer at a low-cost travel arrangement.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to determine whether the competitor's available booking codes

Art Unit: 3623

are at a lower price than those which the availability system indicates the user of the system can offer with the motivation of accessing the travel arrangement that would be cheapest for the customer.

As per claims 12, 13, neither Walker et al nor Talluri disclose wherein if the competitor's available booking codes are not at a lower price, then the system can return a bias towards making the seat unavailable/wherein if the competitor's available booking codes are not at a lower price, then the system can test whether an original query was for a low cost fare and return a bias towards making the seat not available if the original query was for a low fare. However, Walker et al and Talluri would have included the above limitation with the motivation of making seats more readily available to customers.

However, Lynch '094 discloses:

Wherein if the competitor's available booking codes are not at a lower price, then the system can return a bias towards making the seat unavailable/wherein if the competitor's available booking codes are not at a lower price, then the system can test whether an original query was for a low cost fare and return a bias towards making the seat not available if the original query was for a low fare, (Col. 8, lines 27-32, [identifying within fare class restrictions]). Lynch '094 discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of identifying alternate low-cost travel arrangements.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to return a bias towards making a seat unavailable if the booking codes are not at a lower price with the motivation of not going outside of a price range

and subjecting the customer to unnecessary costs.

11. Claims 24, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Walker et al (US 5,897,620), in further view of Lynch et al (US Patent 6,018,715).

As per claim 24, neither Walker et al nor Talluri disclose wherein the instructions to compare determine whether the predicted answer indicates that a competitor is in a more favorable or less favorable competitive position than the potential, actual availability response produced by the availability system. However, Walker et al and Talluri would have included the above limitation with the motivation of determining if the available seats on an airline are accommodating to customers.

However Lynch et al '715' discloses:

wherein the instructions to compare determine whether the predicted answer indicates that a competitor is in a more favorable or less favorable competitive position than the potential, actual availability response produced by the availability system, (Col. 7, lines 17-40, where the decision logic is represented as fuzzy logic [representations] in Lynch et al and they determine that Delta Airlines, American Airlines and Continental Airlines [all competitors] have different logic values which are weighted according to preferred plan). Lynch '715 discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of determining if customers prefer the accommodation for the flight.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to determine whether the predicted answer indicates that a competitor is in a more favorable or less favorable competitive position than the potential, actual availability response produced by the availability system with the

motivation of determining the best travel arrangement according to the traveler's preferences and satisfying the traveler as a customer.

As per claim 29, Walker et al fails to disclose wherein the instructions to compare determines whether the competitor's available booking codes are at a lower price than those that the user of the product can offer, however, Walker et would have included the above limitation with the motivation of determining if the available seats on an airline are accommodating to customers.

However, Lynch et al '094 discloses:

wherein the instructions to compare determines whether the competitor's available booking codes are at a lower price than those that the user of the product can offer, (Col. 3, lines 59-63, [alternate, low-cost travel arrangements]). Lynch et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of accommodating the customer at a low-cost travel arrangement.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to determine whether the competitor's available booking codes are at a lower price than those that the user of the product can offer with the motivation of accessing the travel arrangement that would be cheapest for the customer.

As per claim 30, Walker et al fails to disclose wherein if the competitor's available booking codes are not at a lower price, then the instructions return a bias towards making the seat unavailable. However, Walker et al would have included the above limitation with the motivation of making seats more readily available to customers.

However, Lynch '094 discloses:

wherein if the competitor's available booking codes are not at a lower price, then the instructions return a bias towards making the seat unavailable, (Col. 8, lines 27-32, [identifying within fare class restrictions]). Lynch '094 discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of identifying alternate low-cost travel arrangements.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to return a bias towards making a seat unavailable if the booking codes are not at a lower price with the motivation of not going outside of a price range and subjecting the customer to unnecessary costs.

### ***Response to Arguments***

12. The applicant has argued that the finality of the last office action should be withdrawn since the examiner furnished a new rejection based on new art. Upon reviewing the claims, the examiner has decided that the finality of the previous rejection was premature and has withdrawn the finality.

13. The examiner has previously restricted newly added claims 21-30 based on the addition of "receipt of a query" and "sending an actual answer message as the actual availability answer in response to the query". In response, the applicant has deleted "receive a query for seating availability; and in response to the query" and other recitations involving "query" from new claims 21-30. The claims are now consonant with the originally filed claims and the examiner has examined them accordingly.

14. Applicant's arguments filed 11/5/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.



As per claim 1, the applicant argues that neither Walker et al or Talluri address the subject matter of claim 1, which is to predict what a competitor's availability answer for an airline seat would be in response to a query for seat availability. However, as described in the rejection, Walker et al discloses the availability predictor by disclosing the RMS. In this case, the RMS allows for the storage of seat allocation of competitive forces stored once they are calculated in Col. 8, lines 40-50. In addition, Col. 13, lines 31-48 of Walker et al shows a request for flight information for a specific itinerary, wherein the traveler is notified of the potential availability. This request represents the query.

Applicant also argues that the references do not suggest decision logic that compares the predicted answer from the availability predictor and the potential answer from the availability system to establish a decision with respect to actual availability. However, it is the combination of Walker et al and Talluri that discloses this feature. Walker et al discloses comparing actual demand to expected (forecasted) demand, where decision is determining whether or not to allocate additional inventory or reduce/eliminate inventory in Col. 5, lines 18-25. Talluri was introduced to show that decision logic can be used to control logic to support decisions to accept or deny requests for resource capacity (seats) in the Abstract, lines 1-5. Also, in Col. 5, lines 4-5, Talluri actually shows decision logic, and in Col. 2, lines 30-35, Talluri also shows that in control logic schemes, algorithms are used to compute parameters.

As per claims 2-16, these claims depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are rejected for the same reasons.

As per claim 17, the applicant argues that the reference fail to disclose "receiving...an actual availability response for a flight and comparing the predicted answer from the availability predictor and the potential answer from the availability system to establish a decision with respect to actual availability. However, Walker discloses comparing the actual demand to expected (forecasted) demand, where decision is determining whether or not to allocate additional inventory or reduce/eliminate inventory in Col. 5, lines 18-25.

As per claims 21-30 and 32, the applicant argues that the references fail to disclose a computing device that produce a potential, actual availability response for a fight, predict seating availability on a competitor's flight that is a competitive fight to the flight and produce a predicted answer, or instructions to compare the predicted answer and the potential availability answer...to establish an actual answer message with respect to seat availability. However, Walker et al describes these features in Col. 5, lines 15-33, where the actual demand for an actual flight is reevaluated and the inventory (seats) for that flight is monitored. This inventory allocated to actual flights represents the actual availability response. In addition, in Col. 5, lines 18-25, Walker et al discloses the comparison of the actual demand to expected (forecasted) demand, where decision is determining whether or not to allocate additional inventory or reduce/eliminate inventory.

As per claim 4, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

As per claims 11-13, the combination of Walker et al and Talluri disclose testing whether the competitor's available booking codes are at a lower price than those that

the availability system indicates the user so the system can offer. However, the combination of Walker et al, Talluri, and Lynch '094 discloses this feature. Specifically, in Col. 3, lines 59-63, Lynch '094 discloses alternate, low-cost travel arrangements. Again, the combination of Walker et al, Talluri, and Lynch '094 discloses the feature of testing if the competitor's available booking codes are not at a lower price, then the system can return a bias towards making the seat unavailable, and testing whether an original query was for a low cost fare and return a bias towards making the seat not available if the original query was for a low fare. Specifically, Lynch '094 discloses this in Col. 8, lines 27-32, where Lynch '094 identifies within fare class restrictions.

### ***Conclusion***

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3623

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 703-305-1340. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 am-5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 703-305-9643. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7238 [After final communications, labeled "Box AF"], 703-746-7239 [Official Communications], and 703-746-7150 [Informal/Draft Communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"].

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

*ARB*

A. R. B.  
November 15, 2004

  
TARIQ R. HAFIZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600